



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,151	04/09/2001	Alan Young	063170.6800	8242
5073	7590	07/29/2008		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER NGUYEN, TAN D	
			ART UNIT 3689	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/29/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/829,151	Applicant(s) YOUNG, ALAN	
	Examiner Tan Dean D. Nguyen	Art Unit 3689	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed 4/10/08 has been entered. Claims 1-7, 9-13 are pending. Claims 1-7, 11-13 (method), 9 (system) 10 (apparatus) are pending and are rejected as followed.

As of 4/28/08, independent method claim 1 is as followed:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for reporting a value of a key performance indicator comprising:

(a) receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor;

(b) identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator;

c) receiving a business event message indicating an occurrence of the business event, the business event message including business data describing the business event;

(d) in response to receiving the business event message, electronically determining the value of the key performance indicator based on the business data; and
(d) displaying the determined value of the key performance indicator via a contextual visualization interface.

Note: for convenience, alphabetical letters (a)-(d) are attached to the beginning of each step.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 11-13 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

1) It's not clear how the limitations of claim 11 further limits step (c) of "receiving a business event message" above? In other word, once business event message has been received, how would identifying an expected time when the business message should be received further limits "has been received"?

2) It's not clear how the limitations of claim 12 further limits step (a) of "receiving information" which could include "plural information" or "data" which could include "plural data"? How would "additional" data or information further limit the "plural information" in steps (a)-(c) of claim 1 above?

3) It's not clear how the limitations of claim 13 further limits "the business event message" of step (c) above?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1-7 (method), 9 (system) and 10 (apparatus) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ORACLE or PEOPLESOFT or COGNOS in view of BATTAT et al.

As of 4/28/08, independent method claim 1 is as followed:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for reporting a value of a key performance indicator comprising:

(a) receiving information identifying a selected key performance indicator to monitor;

(b) identifying at least one business event associated with the selected key performance indicator;

c) receiving a business event message indicating an occurrence of the business event, the business event message including business data describing the business event;

(d) in response to receiving the business event message, electronically determining the value of the key performance indicator based on the business data; and

(d) displaying the determined value of the key performance indicator via a contextual visualization interface.

Note: for convenience, alphabetical letters (a)-(d) are attached to the beginning of each step.

ORACLE is cited to teach a business monitoring and management application and integrated information source including the use of tracking key performance indicators (KPI) and forecasting business opportunity to improve competitive advantage and enhance business operation with multidimensional analysis by empowering the business managers and executives to easily analyze e-business sales information and marketing data via a standard web browser {see page 1}. The software provides global access to real time sales forecasts information, marketing trends and internet click-stream data to enhance a company's customer intelligence {see page 1}. The steps of (a)-(e) are merely steps involved in monitoring and reporting a business performance and these are inherently including in the accessing the information, monitoring and analyzing and marketing of data including the tracking of the KPI via a standard Web browser as cited in ORACLE above. As for the limitation of the monitoring information includes business event message, this limitation appears to be included in the above teachings since business event message reads over business information or business data. Therefore, ORACLE fairly teaches the claimed invention except for the usage of a contextual visualization interface in the "displaying" step.

PEOPLESOFT is cited to teach a business monitoring and management application and integrated cause-and-effect perspective on key management processes

Art Unit: 3689

by providing the capabilities necessary to design and monitor critical success factors and calculate KPI to help managers develop and execute organizational strategy {see page 1}. The PeopleSoft Balanced scorecard leverages data and metrics from internal and external data sources and provides a focal point for EPM's four business solutions: Strategic & Financial management, Workforce Analytics and Industry Process management, and Customer Relationship management {see page 1}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of BATTAT et al to further include KPI application as taught by PEOPLESOFT for at least one of the many benefits cited above, i.e. KPI to help managers develop and execute EPM's four business solutions: Strategic & Financial management, Workforce Analytics and Industry Process management, and Customer Relationship management. As for the limitation of the monitoring information includes business event message, this limitation appears to be included in the above teachings since business event message reads over business information or business data. Therefore, PEOPLESOFT fairly teaches the claimed invention except for the usage of a contextual visualization interface in the "displaying" step.

COGNOS is cited to teach allows organizations to deliver business intelligence ~~applications~~ across the enterprise based on a shared dimensional framework. From the building of subject area data marts, to the automatic design and deployment of business models and reports, DecisionStream is the foundation for end-to-end BI. Its integration with PowerPlay, Impromptu, and Cognos Visualizer allows users to identify and analyze trends and ~~key performance indicators~~ and drill through to relational data reports for transaction-level details. The result is that all users have access to consistent

data for more informed and coordinated analysis, reporting, and decision-making across and outside the enterprise. As for the limitation of the monitoring information includes business event message, this limitation appears to be included in the above teachings since business event message reads over business information or business data. Therefore, COGNOS fairly teaches the claimed invention except for the usage of a contextual visualization interface in the “displaying” step.

In a network management system, BATTAT et al is cited to teach a method for monitoring an object by reporting /displaying information with respect to change of information, message and events related to the object, comprising the steps receiving business event message information indicating an occurrence of the business event and how these events messages affect the monitoring object and wherein the result of change of the events are displayed via a contextual visualization (real world) interface to obtain the benefits of allowing the user to be intuitive as if physically present in a real world environment or high degree of user defined customization or business process overview as indicated as shown on col. 4, line 47 to col. 5, line 51. See also Fig. 3, steps (301), (302), (303), (304), (305), (306), (307), (308), (309), (310), and (311), Fig. 1, Fig. 10j, col. 8, lines 5-67, col. 15, lines 22-40).

It would have been obvious to modify the displaying interface in the monitoring a business performance of ORACLE or PEOPLESOFT or COGNOS by using a contextual visualization interface as taught by BATTAT et al to obtain the benefits of allowing the user to be intuitive as if physically present in a real world environment or high degree of user defined customization or business process overview as indicated as

Art Unit: 3689

shown on col. 4, line 47 to col. 5, line 51. See also Fig. 3, steps (301), (302), (303), (304), (305), (306), (307), (308), (309), (310), and (311), Fig. 1, Fig. 10j, col. 8, lines 5-67, col. 15, lines 22-40). Note that BATTAT et al also teaches step (c) of receiving business information including business event message and how this event message affects the status or the result of the monitoring object and therefore it would have also been obvious to modify the teachings of PEOPLESOFT or COGNOS or ORACLE to include business event message as taught by BATTAT et al as mere including other relevant business information.

As for dep. claims 2-6 (part of 1 above), which deal with the type of business event message or features of the messages with respect to events or data or information, these are non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and are fairly taught in Fig. 3A and 3 element (304) of BATTAT et al.

As for dep. claim 7 (part of 1 above), which deal with the type of PKI, i.e. prediction (trend or forecast), this is fairly taught in COGNOS or PEOPLESOFT or ORACLE, as described above.

As for independent system claim 9 or 10, which is merely the system/apparatus to carry out the method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the system/apparatus of BATTAT et al (Figs. 1, 2 and 3) and COGNOS or PEOPLESOFT or ORACLE. Alternatively, the set up of a computer system to carry out a respective computed-method claim would have been obvious to a skilled artisan.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see Response, filed 4/8/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-7, 9-10 under the 103 rejections have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

1) Applicant's major arguments that the above teachings of ORACLE or PEOPLESOFT or COGNOS in view of BATTAT et al fail to teach "receiving a business event message indicating an occurrence of the business event, the business event message including business data describing the business event" are not persuasive because this reads over "receiving information" wherein the information is about "a business event messagebusiness data describing the business event", and are considered as functional descriptive material (FDM) and have no patentable weight. They reads over "business information or business data". As long as there is a determination the value of KPI step based on the data, how the data functions above does not have much patentable weight.

2) Similarly, applicant's argument on page 10 with respect to another function of the information/event messages "describing a task failure event", again, this is merely the function of the information/data or NFDM and has no patentable weight in a data processing method.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3689

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 3689

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor Janice Mooneyham can be reached at (571) 272-6805.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

/Tan Dean D. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689
July 21, 2008